



Asynchronous Pipeline for Processing Huge Corpora on Medium to Low Resource Infrastructures

Pedro Javier Ortiz Suárez, Benoît Sagot, Laurent Romary

► To cite this version:

Pedro Javier Ortiz Suárez, Benoît Sagot, Laurent Romary. Asynchronous Pipeline for Processing Huge Corpora on Medium to Low Resource Infrastructures. 7th Workshop on the Challenges in the Management of Large Corpora (CMLC-7), Jul 2019, Cardiff, United Kingdom. 10.14618/IDS-PUB-9021 . hal-02148693

HAL Id: hal-02148693

<https://inria.hal.science/hal-02148693>

Submitted on 13 Jul 2019

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution| 4.0 International License

Asynchronous Pipeline for Processing Huge Corpora on Medium to Low Resource Infrastructures

Pedro Javier Ortiz Suárez^{1,2} Benoît Sagot¹ Laurent Romary¹

¹Inria, Paris, France

²Sorbonne Université, Paris, France

{pedro.ortiz, benoit.sagot, laurent.romary}@inria.fr

Abstract

Common Crawl is a considerably large, heterogeneous multilingual corpus comprised of crawled documents from the internet, surpassing 20TB of data and distributed as a set of more than 50 thousand plain text files where each contains many documents written in a wide variety of languages. Even though each document has a metadata block associated to it, this data lacks any information about the language in which each document is written, making it extremely difficult to use Common Crawl for monolingual applications. We propose a general, highly parallel, multithreaded pipeline to clean and classify Common Crawl by language; we specifically design it so that it runs efficiently on medium to low resource infrastructures where I/O speeds are the main constraint. We develop the pipeline so that it can be easily reapplied to any kind of heterogeneous corpus and so that it can be parameterised to a wide range of infrastructures. We also distribute a 6.3TB version of Common Crawl, filtered, classified by language, shuffled at line level in order to avoid copyright issues, and ready to be used for NLP applications.

1 Introduction

In recent years neural methods for Natural Language Processing (NLP) have consistently and repeatedly improved the state-of-the-art in a wide variety of NLP tasks such as parsing, PoS-tagging, named entity recognition, machine translation, text classification and reading comprehension among others. Probably the main contributing factor in this steady improvement for NLP models is the raise in usage of *transfer learning* techniques in the field. These methods normally consist of taking a pre-trained model and reusing it, with little to no retraining, to solve a different task from the original one it was intended to solve;

in other words, one *transfers* the *knowledge* from one task to another.

Most of the transfer learning done in NLP nowadays is done in an unsupervised manner, that is, it normally consist of a *language model* that is fed unannotated plain text in a particular language; so that it *extracts* or *learns* the basic *features* and patterns of the given language, the model is subsequently used on top of an specialised architecture designed to tackle a particular NLP task. Probably the best known example of this type of model are *word embeddings* which consist of real-valued vector representations that are trained for each word on a given corpus. Some notorious examples of word embeddings are word2vec (Mikolov et al., 2013), GloVe (Pennington et al., 2014) and fastText (Mikolov et al., 2018). All these models are *context-free*, meaning that a given word has one single vector representation that is independent of context, thus for a polysemous word like Washington, one would have one single representation that is reused for the city, the state and the US president.

In order to overcome the problem of polysemy, *contextual* models have recently appeared. Most notably ELMo (Peters et al., 2018) which produces deep contextualised word representations out of the internal states of a deep bidirectional language model in order to model word use and how the usage varies across linguistic contexts. ELMo still needs to be used alongside a specialised architecture for each given downstream task, but newer architectures that can be fine-tuned have also appear. For these, the model is first fed unannotated data, and is then fine-tuned with annotated data to a particular downstream task without relying on any other architecture. The most remarkable examples of this type of model are GPT-1, GPT-2 (Radford et al., 2018, 2019), BERT (Devlin et al., 2018) and XLNet (Yang et al., 2019);

the latter being the current state-of-the-art for multiple downstream tasks. All of these models are different arrangements of the Transformer architecture (Vaswani et al., 2017) trained with different datasets, except for XLNet which is an instance of the Transformer-XL (Dai et al., 2019).

Even though these models have clear advantages, their main drawback is the amount of data that is needed to train them in order to obtain a functional and efficient model. For the first English version of word2vec, Mikolov et al. (2013) used a one billion word dataset consisting of various news articles. Later Al-Rfou et al. (2013) and then Bojanowski et al. (2017) used the plain text from Wikipedia to train distributions of word2vec and fastText respectively, for languages other than English. Now, the problem of obtaining large quantities of data aggravates even more for contextual models, as they normally need multiple instances of a given word in order to capture all its different uses and in order to avoid overfitting due to the large quantity of hyperparameters that these models have. Peters et al. (2018) for example use a 5.5 billion token¹ dataset comprised of crawled news articles plus the English Wikipedia in order to train ELMo, Devlin et al. (2018) use a 3.3 billion word² corpus made by merging the English Wikipedia with the BooksCorpus (Zhu et al., 2015), and Radford et al. (2019) use a 40GB English corpus created by scraping outbound links from Reddit.³

While Wikipedia is freely available, and multiple pipelines exist^{4,5} to extract plain text from it, some of the bigger corpora mentioned above are not made available by the authors either due to copyright issues or probably because of the infrastructure needed to serve and distribute such big corpora. Moreover the vast majority of both these models and the corpora they are trained with are in English, meaning that the availability of high quality NLP for other languages, specially for low-resource languages, is rather limited.

To address this problem, we choose Common Crawl,⁶ which is a 20TB multilingual free to use corpus composed of crawled websites from the

internet, and we propose a highly parallel multi-threaded asynchronous pipeline that applies well-known concurrency patterns, to clean and classify by language the whole Common Crawl corpus to a point where it is usable for Machine Learning and in particular for neural NLP applications. We optimise the pipeline so that the process can be completed in a sensible amount of time even in infrastructures where Input/Output (I/O) speeds become the main bottleneck.

Knowing that even running our pipeline will not always be feasible, we also commit to publishing our own version of a classified by language, filtered and ready to use Common Crawl corpus upon publication of this article. We will set up an easy to use interface so that people can download a manageable amount of data on a desired target language.

2 Related Work

Common Crawl has already been successfully used to train language models, even multilingual ones. The most notable example is probably fastText which was first trained for English using Common Crawl (Mikolov et al., 2018) and then for other 157 different languages (Grave et al., 2018). In fact Grave et al. (2018) proposed a pipeline to filter, clean and classify their fastText multilingual word embeddings, which we shall call the “fastText pre-processing pipeline.” They used the fastText linear classifier (Joulin et al., 2016, 2017) to classify each line of Common Crawl by language, and downloaded the initial corpus and schedule the I/O using some simple Bash scripts. Their solution, however, proved to be a synchronous blocking pipeline that works well on infrastructures having the necessary hardware to assure high I/O speeds even when storing tens of terabytes of data at a time. But that down-scales poorly to medium-low resource infrastructures that rely on more traditional cost-effective electromechanical mediums in order to store this amount of data.

Concerning contextual models, Baevski et al. (2019) trained a BERT-like bi-directional Transformer for English using Common Crawl. They followed the “fastText pre-processing pipeline” but they removed all copies of Wikipedia inside Common Crawl. They also trained their model using News Crawl (Bojar et al., 2018) and using Wikipedia + BooksCorpus, they compared three

¹Punctuation marks are counted as tokens.

²Space separated tokens.

³<https://www.reddit.com/>

⁴<https://github.com/attardi/wikiextractor>

⁵<https://github.com/hghodraty/wikifil>

⁶<http://commoncrawl.org/>

models and showed that Common Crawl gives the best performance out of the three corpora.

The XLNet model was trained for English by joining the BookCorpus, English Wikipedia, Giga5 (Parker et al., 2011), ClueWeb 2012-B (Callan et al., 2009) and Common Crawl. Particularly for Common Crawl, Yang et al. (2019) say they use “heuristics to aggressively filter out short or low-quality articles” from Common Crawl, however they don’t give any detail about these “heuristics” nor about the pipeline they use to classify and extract the English part of Common Crawl.

It is important to note that none of these projects distributed their classified, filtered and cleaned versions of Common Crawl, making it difficult in general to faithfully reproduce their results.

3 Common Crawl

Common Crawl is a non-profit foundation which produces and maintains an open repository of web crawled data that is both accessible and analysable.⁷ Common Crawl’s complete web archive consists of petabytes of data collected over 8 years of web crawling. The repository contains raw web page HTML data (WARC files), metadata extracts (WAT files) and plain text extracts (WET files). The organisation’s crawlers has always respected `nofollow`⁸ and `robots.txt`⁹ policies.

Each monthly Common Crawl snapshot is in itself a massive multilingual corpus, where every single file contains data coming from multiple web pages written in a large variety of languages and covering all possible types of topics. Thus, in order to effectively use this corpus for the previously mentioned Natural Language Processing and Machine Learning applications, one has first to extract, filter, clean and classify the data in the snapshot by language.

For our purposes we use the WET files which contain the extracted plain texts from the websites mostly converted to UTF-8, as well as headers containing the metadata of each crawled document. Each WET file comes compressed in gzip format¹⁰ and is stored on Amazon Web Services.

⁷<http://commoncrawl.org/about/>

⁸<http://microformats.org/wiki/rel-nofollow>

⁹<https://www.robotstxt.org/>

¹⁰<https://www.gnu.org/software/gzip/>

We use the November 2018 snapshot which surpasses 20TB of uncompressed data and contains more than 50 thousand plain text files where each file consists of the plain text from multiple websites along its metadata header. From now on, when we mention the “Common Crawl” corpus, we refer to this particular November 2018 snapshot.

4 fastText’s Pipeline

In order to download, extract, filter, clean and classify Common Crawl we base ourselves on the “fastText pre-processing pipeline” used by Grave et al. (2018). Their pipeline first launches multiple process, preferably as many as available cores. Each of these processes first downloads one Common Crawl WET file which then proceeds to decompress after the download is over. After decompressing, an instance of the fastText linear classifier (Joulin et al., 2016, 2017) is launched, the classifier processes each WET file line by line, generating a language tag for each line. The tags are then stored in a tag file which holds a one-to-one correspondence between lines of the WET file and its corresponding language tag. The WET file and the tag files are read sequentially and each on the WET file line holding the condition of being longer than 100 bytes is appended to a language file containing only plain text (tags are discarded). Finally the tag file and the WET files are deleted.

Only when one of these processes finishes another can be launched. This means that one can at most process and download as many files as cores the machine has. That is, if for example a machine has 24 cores, only 24 WET files can be downloaded and processed simultaneously, moreover, the 25th file won’t be downloaded until one of the previous 24 files is completely processed.

When all the WET files are classified, one would normally get around 160 language files, each file holding just plain text written in its corresponding language. These files still need to be filtered in order to get rid of all files containing invalid UTF-8 characters, so again a number of processes are launched, this time depending on the amount of memory of the machine. Each process reads a language file, first filters for invalid UTF-8 characters and then performs deduplication. A simple non-collision resistant hashing algorithm is used to deduplicate the files.

The fastText linear classifier works by repre-




Figure 1: A scheme of the *goclassy* pipeline. The red square represents the Compressed WET files stored on Amazon Web Services. The icons represent the gzip files stored locally, the represent one of the 50K WET files. The represents the filtered file and the represents a file of language tags, one tag per line in . The represents one of the 166 classified files. Each arrow represents an asynchronous non blocking worker and dotted arrows represent a line filtering process.

sentencing sentences for classification as Bags of Words (BoW) and training a linear classifier. A weight matrix A is used as a look-up table over the words and the word representations are then averaged into a text representation which is fed to the linear classifier. The architecture is in general similar to the CBoW model of Mikolov et al. (2013) but the middle word is replaced by a label. They uses a softmax function f to compute the probability distribution over the classes. For a set of N documents, the model is trained to minimise the negative log-likelihood over the classes:

$$-\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N y_n \log(f(BAx_n)),$$

where x_n is the normalised bag of features of the n -th document, y_n is the n -th label, and A, B are the weight matrices. The pre-trained fastText model for language recognition (Grave et al., 2018) is capable of recognising around 176 different languages and was trained using 400 million tokens from Wikipedia as well as sentences from the Tatoeba website¹¹.

5 Asynchronous pipeline

We propose a new pipeline derived from the fastText one which we call *goclassy*, we reuse the fastText linear classifier (Joulin et al., 2016, 2017) and the pre-trained fastText model for language recognition (Grave et al., 2018), but we

completely rewrite and parallelise their pipeline in an asynchronous manner.

The order of operations is more or less the same as in the fastText pre-processing pipeline but instead of clustering multiple operations into a single blocking process, we launch a worker for each operation and we bound the number of possible parallel operations at a given time by the number of available threads instead of the number of CPUs. We implement *goclassy* using the Go programming language¹² so we let the Go runtime¹³ handle the scheduling of the processes. Thus in our pipeline we don't have to wait for a whole WET file to download, decompress and classify in order to start downloading and processing the next one, a new file will start downloading and processing as soon as the scheduler is able to allocate a new process.

When using electromechanical mediums of storage, I/O blocking is one of the main problems one encounters. To overcome this, we introduced buffers in all our I/O operations, a feature that is not present in the fastText pre-processing pipeline. We also create, from the start, a file for each of the 176 languages that the pre-trained fastText language classifier is capable of recognising, and we always leave them open, as we find that getting a file descriptor to each time we want to write, if we wanted leave them open just when needed, introduces a big overhead.

¹²<https://golang.org/>

¹³<https://golang.org/src/runtime/mprof.go>

¹¹<https://tatoeba.org/>

	10 files			100 files			200 files		
	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean
<i>real</i>									
fastText	2m50s	6m45s	3m31s	13m46s	38m38s	17m39s	26m20s	47m48s	31m4s
goclassy	1m23s	3m12s	1m42s	7m42s	12m43s	9m8s	15m3s	15m47s	15m16s
<i>user</i>									
fastText	26m45s	27m2s	26m53s	4h21m	4h24m	4h23m	8h42m	8h48m	8h45m
goclassy	10m26s	12m53s	11m0s	1h46m	1h54m	1h49m	3h37m	3h40m	3h38m
<i>sys</i>									
fastText	40.14s	40.85s	40.56s	6m14s	6m17s	6m15s	12m26s	12m45s	12m31s
goclassy	37.34s	45.98s	39.67s	5m7s	5m34s	5m16s	9m57s	10m14s	10m5s

Table 1: Benchmarks are done using the UNIX `time` tool, are repeated 10 times each and are done for random samples of 10, 100 and 200 WET files. Only the classifying and filtering part are benchmarked. The table shows the minimum, maximum and mean time for the user, real and sys time over the 10 runs. Here “fastText” is used as short for the pipeline.

We also do the filtering and cleaning processes at line level before feeding each line to the classifier, which makes us create a new filtered file so that we can have a correspondence with the tag file, which in turn will consume more space, but that will also reduce the amount of unnecessary classifications performed by fastText. The filtered and file tags are then read and lines are appended to its corresponding language file. The writing in the classification step is asynchronous, meaning that process writing a line to the filtered files does not wait for the classifier to write a tag on the tag file. Figure 1 shows the pipeline up to this point.

After all WET files are processed, we then use Isaac Whitfield’s deduplication tool `runiq`¹⁴ which is based on Yann Collet’s `xxhash64`¹⁵, an extremely fast non-cryptographic hash algorithm that is resistant to collisions. We finally use the Mark Adler’s `pigz`¹⁶ for data compression, as opposed to the canonical UNIX tools proposed in the original fastText pipeline. We add both tools to our concurrent pipeline, executing multiple instances of them in parallel, in order to ensure we use the most of our available resources at a given time.

Beyond improving the computational time required to classify this corpus, we propose a simple improvement on the cleaning scheme in the fastText pre-processing pipeline. This improvement allows our pipeline to better take into account the multilingual nature of Common Crawl; that is, we count UTF-8 characters instead of bytes for setting the lower admissible bound for the length of a line to be fed into the classifier. This straightforward

modification on the fastText pre-processing pipeline assures we take into account the multiple languages present in Common Crawl that use non-ASCII encoded characters.

Given that our implementation is written in Go, we release binary distributions¹⁷ of `goclassy` for all major operating systems. Both `pigz` and `runiq` are also available for all major operating systems.

6 Benchmarks

We test both pipelines against one another in an infrastructure using traditional electromechanical storage mediums that are connected to the main processing machine via an Ethernet interface, that is, a low I/O speed environment as compared to an infrastructure where one would have an array of SSDs connected directly to the main processing machine via a high speed interface. We use a machine with an Intel® Xeon® Processor E5-2650 2.00 GHz, 20M Cache, and 203.1 GiB of RAM. We make sure that no other processes apart from the benchmark and the Linux system processes are run. We do not include downloading, decompression or deduplication in our benchmarks as downloading takes far too much time, and deduplication and compression were performed with third party tools that don’t make part of our main contribution. We are mainly interested in seeing how the way the data is fed to the classifier impacts the overall processing time.

Benchmarks in table 1 of our `goclassy` pipeline show a drastic reduction in processing time compared to the original fastText preprocessing pipeline. We show that in our particular infrastructure, we are capable of reducing the *real* time

¹⁴<https://github.com/whitfin/runiq>

¹⁵<https://github.com/Cyan4973/xxHash>

¹⁶<https://zlib.net/pigz/>

¹⁷<https://github.com/pjox/goclassy>

as measured by the `time` UNIX tool almost always by half. The `user` time which represents the amount of CPU time spent in user-mode code (outside the kernel) within the process is almost three times lower for our `goclassy` pipeline, this particular benchmark strongly suggest a substantial reduction in energy consumption of `goclassy` with respect to the `fastText` pipeline.

As we understand that even an infrastructure with more than 20TB of free space in traditional electromechanical storage is not available to everyone and we propose a simple parametrization in our pipeline that actively deletes already processed data and that only downloads and decompresses files when needed, thus ensuring that no more than 10TB of storage are used at a given time. We nevertheless note that delaying decompression increases the amount of computation time, which is a trade-off that some users might make as it might be more suitable for their available infrastructure.

7 OSCAR

Finally, we are aware that some users might not even have access to a big enough infrastructure to run our pipelines or just to store all the Common Crawl data. Moreover, even if previously used and cited in NLP and Machine Learning research, we note that there is currently no public distribution of Common Crawl that is filtered, classified by language and ready to use for Machine Learning or NLP applications. Thus we decide to publish a pre-processed version of the November 2018 copy of Common Crawl which is comprised of usable data in 166 different languages, we publish¹⁸ our version under the name OSCAR which is short for *Open Super-large Crawled AL-ManaCH*¹⁹ *coRpus*.

After processing all the data with `goclassy`, the size of the whole Common Crawl corpus is reduced to 6.3TB, but in spite of this considerable reduction, OSCAR still dwarfs all previous mentioned corpora having more 800 billion “words” or spaced separated tokens and noting that this in fact in an understatement of how big OSCAR is, as some of the largest languages within OSCAR such as Chinese and Japanese do not use spaces. The sizes in bytes for both the original and the deduplicated versions of OSCAR can be found in table 2. OSCAR is published under the *Creative Com-*

*mons CC0 license (“no rights reserved”)*²⁰, so it is free to use for all applications.

8 Conclusions

We are sure that our work will greatly benefit researchers working on an either constrain infrastructure or a low budget setting. We are also confident, that by publishing a classified version of Common Crawl, we will substantially increase the amount of available public data for medium to low resource languages, thus improving and facilitating NLP research for them. Furthermore, as our pipeline speeds-up and simplifies the treatment of Common Crawl, we believe that our contribution can be further parallelised and adapted to treat multiple snapshots of Common Crawl opening the door to what would be otherwise costly diachronic studies of the use of a given language throughout the internet.

Finally, we note that both our proposed pipeline is data independent, which means that they can be reused to process, clean and classify any sort of big multilingual corpus that is available in plain text form and that is UTF-8 encoded; meaning that the impact of our work goes way beyond a single corpus.

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to Inria Paris “*rioc*” computation cluster for providing resources and support, and for allowing us to store the complete copies of both the raw and the filtered Common Crawl versions on their infrastructure.

¹⁸<https://team.inria.fr/almanach/oscar/>

¹⁹<https://team.inria.fr/almanach/>

²⁰<http://creativecommons.org/publicdomain/zero/1.0/>

Language	Size		Words		Language	Size		Words	
	Orig	Dedup	Orig	Dedup		Orig	Dedup	Orig	Dedup
Afrikaans	241M	163M	43,482,801	29,533,437	Lower Sorbian	13K	7.1K	1,787	966
Albanian	2.3G	1.2G	374,196,110	186,856,699	Luxembourgish	29M	21M	4,403,577	3,087,650
Amharic	360M	206M	28,301,601	16,086,628	Macedonian	2.1G	1.2G	189,289,873	102,849,595
Arabic	82G	32G	8,117,162,828	3,171,221,354	Maitihili	317K	11K	69,161	874
Aragonese	1.3M	801K	52,896	45,669	Malagasy	21M	13M	3,068,360	1,872,044
Armenian	3.7G	1.5G	273,919,388	110,196,043	Malay	111M	42M	16,696,882	6,045,753
Assamese	113M	71M	6,956,663	4,366,570	Malayalam	4.9G	2.5G	189,534,472	95,892,551
Asturian	2.4M	2.0M	381,005	325,237	Maltese	24M	17M	2,995,654	2,163,358
Avaric	409K	324K	24,720	19,478	Marathi	2.7G	1.4G	162,609,404	82,130,803
Azerbaijani	2.8G	1.5G	322,641,710	167,742,296	Mazanderani	691K	602K	73,870	64,481
Bashkir	128M	90M	9,796,764	6,922,589	Minangkabau	608K	310K	5,682	4,825
Basque	848M	342M	120,456,652	45,359,710	Mingrelian	5.8M	4.4M	299,098	228,629
Bavarian	503	503	399	399	Mirandese	1.2K	1.1K	171	152
Belarusian	1.8G	1.1G	144,579,630	83,499,037	Modern Greek	62G	27G	5,479,180,137	2,412,419,435
Bengali	11G	5.8G	623,575,733	363,766,143	Mongolian	2.2G	838M	181,307,167	68,362,013
Bihari	110K	34K	8,848	2,875	Nahuatl languages	12K	11K	1,234	1,193
Bishnupriya	4.1M	1.7M	198,286	96,940	Neapolitan	17K	13K	5,282	4,147
Bosnian	447K	116K	106,448	20,485	Nepali	1.8G	1.2G	107,448,208	71,628,317
Breton	29M	16M	5,013,241	2,890,384	Newari	5.5M	4.1M	564,697	288,995
Bulgarian	32G	14G	2,947,648,106	1,268,114,977	Northern Frisian	4.4K	4.4K	1,516	1,516
Burmese	1.9G	1.1G	56,111,184	30,102,173	Northern Luri	76K	63K	8,022	6,740
Catalan	8.0G	4.3G	1,360,212,450	729,333,440	Norwegian	8.0G	4.7G	1,344,326,388	804,894,377
Cebuano	39M	24M	6,603,567	3,675,024	Norwegian Nynorsk	85M	54M	14,764,980	9,435,139
Central Bikol	885	885	312	312	Occitan	5.8M	3.7M	750,301	512,678
Central Khmer	1.1G	581M	20,690,610	10,082,245	Oriya	248M	188M	14,938,567	11,321,740
Central Kurdish	487M	226M	48,478,334	18,726,721	Ossetian	13M	11M	1,031,268	878,765
Chavacano	520	520	130	130	Pampanga	760	304	130	52
Chechen	8.3M	6.7M	711,051	568,146	Panjabi	763M	460M	61,847,806	37,555,835
Chinese	508G	249G	14,986,424,850	6,350,215,113	Persian	79G	38G	9,096,554,121	4,363,505,319
Chuvash	39M	26M	3,041,614	2,054,810	Piemontese	2.1M	1.9M	362,013	337,246
Cornish	44K	14K	8,329	2,704	Polish	109G	47G	15,277,255,137	6,708,709,674
Croatian	226M	110M	34,232,765	16,727,640	Portuguese	124G	64G	20,641,903,898	10,751,156,918
Czech	53G	24G	7,715,977,441	3,540,997,509	Pushto	361M	242M	46,559,441	31,347,348
Danish	16G	9.5G	2,637,463,889	1,620,091,317	Quechua	78K	67K	10,186	8,691
Dhivehi	126M	79M	7,559,472	4,726,660	Romanian	25G	11G	3,984,317,058	1,741,794,069
Dimli	146	146	19	19	Romansh	7.4K	6.5K	1,093	960
Dutch	78G	39G	13,020,136,373	6,598,786,137	Russia Buriat	13K	11K	963	809
Eastern Mari	7.2M	6.0M	565,992	469,297	Russian	1.2T	568G	92,522,407,837	46,692,691,520
Egyptian Arabic	66M	33M	7,305,151	3,659,419	Sanskrit	93M	37M	4,331,569	1,713,930
Emilian-Romagnol	25K	24K	6,376	6,121	Scottish Gaelic	1.9M	1.3M	310,689	207,110
English	2.3T	1.2T	418,187,793,408	215,841,256,971	Serbian	3.9G	2.2G	364,395,411	207,561,168
Erzya	1.4K	1.2K	90	78	Serbo-Croatian	25M	5.8M	5,292,184	1,040,573
Esperanto	299M	228M	48,486,161	37,324,446	Sicilian	3.3K	2.8K	554	468
Estonian	4.8G	2.3G	643,163,730	309,931,463	Sindhi	347M	263M	43,530,158	33,028,015
Finnish	27G	13G	3,196,666,419	1,597,855,468	Sinhala	1.4G	802M	93,053,465	50,864,857
French	282G	138G	46,896,036,417	23,206,776,649	Slovak	9.1G	4.5G	1,322,247,763	656,346,179
Galician	620M	384M	102,011,291	63,600,602	Slovenian	2.5G	1.3G	387,399,700	193,926,684
Georgian	3.6G	1.9G	171,950,621	91,569,739	Somali	61K	16K	1,202	472
German	308G	145G	44,878,908,446	21,529,164,172	South Azerbaijani	27M	19M	2,175,054	1,528,709
Goan Konkani	2.2M	1.8M	124,277	102,306	Spanish	278G	149G	47,545,122,279	25,928,290,729
Guarani	36K	24K	7,382	4,680	Sundanese	211K	141K	30,321	20,278
Gujarati	1.1G	722M	72,045,701	50,023,432	Swahili	13M	8.1M	2,211,927	1,376,963
Haitian	3.9K	3.3K	1,014	832	Swedish	44G	25G	7,155,994,312	4,106,120,608
Hebrew	20G	9.8G	2,067,753,528	1,032,018,056	Tagalog	573M	407M	98,949,299	70,121,601
Hindi	17G	8.9G	1,372,234,782	745,774,934	Tajik	379M	249M	31,758,142	21,029,893
Hungarian	40G	18G	5,163,936,345	2,339,127,555	Tamil	9.3G	5.1G	420,537,132	226,013,330
Icelandic	1.5G	846M	219,900,094	129,818,331	Tatar	670M	305M	51,034,893	23,825,695
Ido	147K	130K	25,702	22,773	Telugu	2.5G	1.6G	123,711,517	79,094,167
Iloko	874K	636K	142,942	105,564	Thai	36G	16G	951,743,087	368,965,202
Indonesian	30G	16G	4,574,692,265	2,394,957,629	Tibetan	187M	138M	1,483,589	936,556
Interlingua	662K	360K	180,231	100,019	Tosk Albanian	5.0M	2.8M	841,750	459,001
Interlingue	24K	1.6K	5,352	602	Turkish	60G	27G	7,577,388,700	3,365,734,289
Irish	88M	60M	14,483,593	10,017,303	Turkmen	11M	6.8M	1,113,869	752,326
Italian	137G	69G	22,248,707,341	11,250,012,896	Tuvianian	12K	7.9K	759	540
Japanese	216G	106G	4,962,979,182	1,123,067,063	Uighur	122M	83M	8,657,141	5,852,225
Javanese	659K	583K	104,896	86,654	Ukrainian	53G	28G	4,204,381,276	2,252,380,351
Kalmyk	113K	112K	10,277	10,155	Upper Sorbian	4.2M	1.8M	545,351	236,867
Kannada	1.7G	1.1G	81,186,863	49,343,462	Urdu	2.7G	1.7G	331,817,982	218,030,228
Karachay-Balkar	2.6M	2.3M	185,436	166,496	Uzbek	21M	12M	2,450,256	1,381,644
Kazakh	2.7G	1.5G	191,126,469	108,388,743	Venetian	18K	17K	3,492	3,199
Kirghiz	600M	388M	44,194,823	28,982,620	Vietnamese	68G	32G	12,036,845,359	5,577,159,843
Komi	2.3M	1.2M	201,404	95,243	Volapik	2.0M	2.0M	321,121	318,568
Korean	24G	12G	2,368,765,142	1,120,375,149	Walloon	273K	203K	50,720	37,543
Kurdish	94M	60M	15,561,003	9,946,440	Waray	2.5M	2.2M	397,315	336,311
Lao	174M	114M	4,133,311	2,583,342	Welsh	213M	133M	37,422,441	23,574,673
Latin	26M	8.3M	4,122,201	1,328,038	Western Frisian	35M	26M	5,691,077	4,223,816
Latvian	4.0G	1.8G	520,761,977	236,428,905	Western Mari	1.2M	1.1M	93,338	87,780
Lezghian	3.3M	3.0M	247,646	224,871	Western Panjabi	12M	9.0M	1,426,986	1,111,112
Limburgan	29K	27K	4,730	4,283	Wu Chinese	109K	32K	11,189	4,333
Lithuanian	8.8G	3.9G	1,159,661,742	516,183,525	Yakut	42M	26M	2,547,623	1,789,174
Lojban	736K	678K	154,330	141,973	Yiddish	141M	84M	13,834,320	8,212,970
Lombard	443K	433K	75,229	73,665	Yoruba	55K	27K	8,906	3,518
Low German	18M	13M	2,906,347	2,146,417	Yue Chinese	3.7K	2.2K	186	128
Total	6.3T	3.2T	844,315,434,723	425,651,344,234					

Table 2: Size of the OSCAR corpus by language measured in bytes and number of words. Standard UNIX human-readable notation is used for the size in byte. We define “words” as spaced separated tokens, which gives a good estimate of the size of each corpus for languages using Latin or Cyrillic alphabets, but might give a misleading size for other languages such as Chinese or Japanese.

References

- Rami Al-Rfou, Bryan Perozzi, and Steven Skiena. 2013. [Polyglot: Distributed word representations for multilingual NLP](#). In *Proceedings of the Seventeenth Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning*, pages 183–192, Sofia, Bulgaria. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alexei Baevski, Sergey Edunov, Yinhan Liu, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Michael Auli. 2019. [Cloze-driven pretraining of self-attention networks](#). *CoRR*, abs/1903.07785.
- Piotr Bojanowski, Edouard Grave, Armand Joulin, and Tomas Mikolov. 2017. [Enriching word vectors with subword information](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 5:135–146.
- Ondřej Bojar, Christian Federmann, Mark Fishel, Yvette Graham, Barry Haddow, Philipp Koehn, and Christof Monz. 2018. [Findings of the 2018 conference on machine translation \(WMT18\)](#). In *Proceedings of the Third Conference on Machine Translation: Shared Task Papers*, pages 272–303, Belgium, Brussels. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jamie Callan, Mark Hoy, Changkuk Yoo, and Le Zhao. 2009. Clueweb09 data set.
- Zihang Dai, Zhilin Yang, Yiming Yang, Jaime G. Carbonell, Quoc V. Le, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. 2019. [Transformer-xl: Attentive language models beyond a fixed-length context](#). *CoRR*, abs/1901.02860.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2018. [BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding](#). *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:1810.04805.
- Edouard Grave, Piotr Bojanowski, Prakhara Gupta, Armand Joulin, and Tomas Mikolov. 2018. [Learning word vectors for 157 languages](#). In *Proceedings of the 11th Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, Miyazaki, Japan. European Language Resource Association.
- Armand Joulin, Edouard Grave, Piotr Bojanowski, Matthijs Douze, Hervé Jégou, and Tomas Mikolov. 2016. [Fasttext.zip: Compressing text classification models](#). *CoRR*, abs/1612.03651.
- Armand Joulin, Edouard Grave, Piotr Bojanowski, and Tomas Mikolov. 2017. [Bag of tricks for efficient text classification](#). In *Proceedings of the 15th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Volume 2, Short Papers*, pages 427–431, Valencia, Spain. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tomas Mikolov, Edouard Grave, Piotr Bojanowski, Christian Puhres, and Armand Joulin. 2018. Advances in pre-training distributed word representations. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation, LREC 2018, Miyazaki, Japan, May 7-12, 2018*.
- Tomas Mikolov, Ilya Sutskever, Kai Chen, Greg Corrado, and Jeffrey Dean. 2013. [Distributed representations of words and phrases and their compositionality](#). In *Proceedings of the 26th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems - Volume 2, NIPS’13*, pages 3111–3119, USA. Curran Associates Inc.
- Robert Parker, David Graff, Junbo Kong, Ke Chen, and Kazuaki Maeda. 2011. English gigaword fifth edition, linguistic data consortium. *Technical report, Technical Report. Linguistic Data Consortium*.
- Jeffrey Pennington, Richard Socher, and Christopher Manning. 2014. [Glove: Global vectors for word representation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 1532–1543, Doha, Qatar. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Matthew Peters, Mark Neumann, Mohit Iyyer, Matt Gardner, Christopher Clark, Kenton Lee, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2018. [Deep contextualized word representations](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*, pages 2227–2237, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alec Radford, Karthik Narasimhan, Tim Salimans, and Ilya Sutskever. 2018. Improving language understanding by generative pre-training. *OpenAI Blog*.
- Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, and Ilya Sutskever. 2019. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI Blog*, 1:8.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. [Attention is all you need](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2017, 4-9 December 2017, Long Beach, CA, USA*, pages 6000–6010.
- Zhilin Yang, Zihang Dai, Yiming Yang, Jaime G. Carbonell, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Quoc V. Le. 2019. [Xlnet: Generalized autoregressive pretraining for language understanding](#). *CoRR*, abs/1906.08237.
- Yukun Zhu, Ryan Kiros, Richard S. Zemel, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, Raquel Urtasun, Antonio Torralba, and Sanja Fidler. 2015. [Aligning books and movies: Towards story-like visual explanations by watching movies and reading books](#). In *2015 IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision, ICCV 2015, Santiago, Chile, December 7-13, 2015*, pages 19–27. IEEE Computer Society.